arXiv:1701.06364v1 [math.CO] 23 Jan 2017

An Improved Bound for Disjoint Directed Cycles

Matija Bucić

ETH Zürich

January 24, 2017

Abstract

We show that every directed graph with minimum out-degree at least $24k$ contains at least k vertex disjoint cycles. This is an improvement over the result of Alon [3] who showed this result for graphs of minimum out-degree at least $64k$.

1 Introduction

Given a directed graph $G(V, E)$ we define the *out-degree* of a vertex v as the number of edges starting in v and denote it as $o(v)$. We say a directed graph G is k-out if every vertex has out-degree at least k. We define $f(k)$ to be the minimal integer x for which any x-out graph G contains k pairwise disjoint cycle subgraphs.

(Throughout this paper a cycle means a directed cycle, while by disjoint subgraphs we mean vertex disjoint subgraphs. We assume that directed graphs do not have parallel edges.)

By considering a complete graph on $2k-1$ vertices we have $f(k) \geq 2k-1$. Bermond and Thomassen [1] conjectured that in fact $f(k) = 2k-1$. Thomassen [2] proved $f(k) = 2k-1$ for $k \leq 2$ and that $f(k)$ is finite for all k, in particular he showed $f(k) \leq (k+1)!$. Alon [3] improved on this and showed that $f(k) \leq 64k$.

We improve on this bound to show $f(k) \leq 24k$. Our proof is based on the same underlying ideas as that of Alon [3], but we give a different treatment of some (non-trivial) base cases, by exploiting the result $f(2) = 3$, due to Thomassen [2], which is what allows the improvement.

2 Preliminary results

We start by proving $f(2) = 3$, first proved by Thomassen [2]. We give a fairly similar proof as it illustrates some of the ideas used in the proof of our main result.

Lemma 2.1. $f(2) = 3$

Proof. A complete digraph on 3 vertices does not contain 2 disjoint cycles, implying $f(2) \geq 3$.

We now prove that any 3-out graph contains 2 disjoint cycles. We proceed by induction on n, the number of vertices. For the basis we consider $n = 4$ when the only possible digraph is the complete graph which contains 2 disjoint cycles of length 2. We now assume that any 3-out digraph, with $n - 1 \geq 4$ vertices, contains 2 disjoint cycles.

Assuming there is a digraph on n vertices failing our assumption, we can remove its edges to make it exactly 3-out, such new graph still does not contain 2 disjoint cycles. We call this digraph G.

For $x, y \in V(G)$ we denote by xy the edge from x to y. If edge xy exists we say x is a *parent* of y and y is a *child* of x. If both edges xy and yx exist we say there is a *bidirectional* edge joining x and y.

G has no bidirectional edges. If uw is a bidirectional edge then $G - \{u, w\}$ is still 1-out so it contains a cycle, which paired with the 2-cycle made by the bidirectional edge uw gives the desired disjoint cycles.

We denote by $N_G^+(v)$ the set of children of v in a graph G and by $N_G^-(v)$ the set of parents of v in a graph G.

The main idea allowing us to prove the result is using edge contractions. If there is an edge uv such that u, v have no common parent, we can modify G to a new graph G' by removing u and v and adding a vertex w having $N_{G'}^+(w) \equiv N_G^+(v)$ and $N_{G'}^-(w) \equiv N_G^-(u) \cup N_G^-(v)$. G' has $n - 1$ nodes and is still 3-out, as u,v had no common parent, so by the inductive assumption G' contains 2 disjoint cycles. If w is not in any of the cycles they were contained in G to start with and we are done. The other option is that w is contained in one of the cycles, this implies the other cycle is in G. We distinguish the cases when the cycle in-edge of w comes from u's in edge or from v's in edge. Replacing w in the first case by uv and in the second by v we get the other cycle in G and are done.

The only remaining option is when every edge of G has a witness (defined as common parent to both its end-vertices).

Let v be a vertex having the smallest in-degree. As there are $3n$ edges in total we have $i(v) \leq 3$, where $i(v)$ denotes the in-degree of the vertex v.

- Case 1: $i(v) = 0$ Then $G - v$ is 3-out and has $n - 1$ vertices so inductively we can find disjoint cycles which are also contained in G.
- Case 2: $i(v) = 1$ The edge ending in v has no witnesses.
- Case 3: $i(v) = 2$ Let $N^-(V) \equiv \{u, w\}$. u has to be the witness to wv and w to uv implying uw is a bidirectional edge which is a contradiction.
- Case 4: $i(v) = 3$ By our choice of v for all $x \in V(G)$ we have $i(x) \geq i(v) = 3$ and $3n = \sum_{x \in V(G)} i(x) \geq ni(v) = 3n$ so we need to have equality in $i(x) \geq i(v)$ for all x implying all vertices have in-degree 3.

  Given a vertex x and its parents u, v, w we show u, v, w make a 3-cycle. Indeed, we

notice that each of the witnesses of ux, vx, wx must be among u, v, w implying that the u, v, w induced subgraph is 1-in. This combined with the fact bidirectional edges do not exist, we conclude that u, v, w make a 3-cycle as claimed.

If we reverse the edges of G we notice that all the above arguments still apply, as G is both exactly 3-out and exactly 3-in, so children of x also form a 3-cycle. As there are no bidirectional edges, the children and parents of x are disjoint and give 2 disjoint 3-cycles.

□

3 The Main Result

As noted before considering the complete graph on $2k-1$ vertices we have $f(k) \geq 2k-1$.

Let r, k be positive integers such that any $r-2$-out digraph contains k disjoint cycles. We say a graph G is (k, r)-*critical* if it satisfies the following properties:

1) G is r-out,

2) G does not contain $k+1$ disjoint cycles,

3) Subject to properties 1) and 2) G has the smallest number of vertices and

4) Subject to properties 1), 2) and 3) G has the smallest possible number of edges.

A (k, r)-critical graph G can not have a bidirectional edge, as else it would contain $k+1$ disjoint cycles, one made by the bidirectional edge and k given by the assumption on r, k for the $r-2$-out graph G with the vertices of the bidirectional edge removed and this would contradict property 2.

If $V(G)$ denotes the set of vertices of G, for any $X \subseteq V(G)$ we denote by $G(X)$ the subgraph of G induced by X.

Proposition 3.1. Let $G(V, E)$ be a (k, r)-critical graph. For any $v \in V$, $G(N^-(v))$ is 1-out.

Proof. For every edge, its endpoints need to have a witness, as else we can contract along this edge which would contradict property 3 of G being critical.

Given any vertex $u \in N^-(v)$, if the edge uv has a witness w we must have $w \in N^-(v)$ and w is a parent of u so $G(N^-(v))$ is 1-in and consequently contains a cycle. □

Proposition 3.2. Let $G(V, E)$ be a (k, r)-critical graph then $k(r^2 - r + 1) \geq |V|$.

Proof. We note that by Property 4, of G being critical, we deduce that $o(v) = r$ for all v. Also from the previous proposition any edge needs to have a witness.

We build an undirected graph H with the set of vertices V and with $u, v \in V$ joined by an edge if and only if they have a common parent in G. For $v \in V$ we have $d_H(v) \leq i_G(v)(r-1)$

as any potential witness of an edge ending in v must be in $N^-(v)$ and each of these $i_G(v)$ vertices have $r-1$ children apart from v.

Now using Turan's Theorem (Theorem 1, page 95 of [4]), we know that there is a set of independent vertices of H with size at least:

$$\sum_{v\in V}\frac{1}{d_H(v)+1}\geq\frac{n^2}{\sum_{v\in V}d_H(v)+n}\geq\frac{n^2}{(r-1)\sum_{v\in V}i_G(v)+n}=\frac{n^2}{(r-1)rn+n}=\frac{n}{r^2-r+1}$$

and we note that an independent set of m vertices in H corresponds to a set of vertices having disjoint in-neighbourhoods so by Proposition 3.2 we can find m disjoint cycles in G. As G does not contain $k+1$ disjoint cycles we have $m\leq k$ so $k(r^2-r+1)\geq|V|$ as desired. □

The following proposition is our main improvement over the result of Alon [3].

Proposition 3.3. Let $l=\left\lceil\frac{k+1}{2}\right\rceil$, if there exists a (k,r) critical graph then:

$$\left(\frac{r^4}{l}+\frac{5}{2}r^3\right)\geq e^{\frac{r-2}{l}}$$

Proof. Let us assume the contrary, so

$$\left(\frac{r^4}{l}+\frac{5}{2}r^3\right)e^{-\frac{r-2}{l}}<1$$

We colour the vertices of G in l colours, uniformly at random. Let A_v be the event that less than 3 children of v are of the same colour. Let B_i be the event that there are no vertices of colour $i\leq l$. We have $\mathbb{P}(A_v)=\left(1-\frac{1}{l}\right)^r\left(1+\frac{r}{l-1}+\frac{r(r-1)}{2(l-1)^2}\right)$ and $\mathbb{P}(B_i)=\left(1-\frac{1}{l}\right)^n\leq\left(1-\frac{1}{l}\right)^{r+1}$. Hence using Proposition 3.2 to bound $n=|V|$ we get:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{v\in V}A_v\cup\bigcup_{i=1}^{l}B_i\right)\leq\sum_{v\in V}\mathbb{P}(A_v)+\sum_{i=1}^{l}\mathbb{P}(B_i)=$$

$$n\left(1-\frac{1}{l}\right)^r\left(1+\frac{r}{l-1}+\frac{r(r-1)}{2(l-1)^2}\right)+l\left(1-\frac{1}{l}\right)^n\leq$$

$$\left(k(r^2-r+1)\left(1+\frac{r}{l-1}+\frac{r(r-1)}{2(l-1)^2}\right)+l-1\right)\left(1-\frac{1}{l}\right)^r\leq$$

$$\left((r^2-r+1)\left(2(l-1)+2r+\frac{r(r-1)}{l-1}\right)+l-1\right)\left(1-\frac{1}{l}\right)^{r-1}<$$

$$\left(\frac{r^4-r^3+r^2}{l-1}+\frac{5}{2}r^3+l\right)\left(1-\frac{1}{l}\right)^{r-1}<$$

$$\left(\frac{r^4}{l-1}+\frac{5}{2}r^3\right)\left(1-\frac{1}{l}\right)^{r-1}<$$

$$\left(\frac{r^4}{l}+\frac{5}{2}r^3\right)e^{-\frac{r-2}{l}}<1$$

Where we used $r \geq 2k \geq 4(l-1)$, where $r \geq 2k$ is implied by any $r-2$-out graph containing k disjoint cycles.

So there is a colouring in which vertices of each colour define a non-empty 3-out graph so as there are l colours we get $2l \geq k+1$ disjoint cycles using $f(2)=3$. This is a contradiction to G being (k,r)-critical. □

Corollary 3.4. $f(k)$ is finite for all values of k.

Proof. Let us assume the opposite and let k be the smallest integer such that $f(k+1)$ is not finite. Hence for any $r \geq f(k)+2$ this implies that there is an r-out graph not containing $k+1$ cycles. All this in turn implies that for arbitrary large r there is a (k,r) critical graph. Which contradicts the above proposition as the RHS is exponential in r while the LHS is a polynomial. □

A more careful bounding in the above derivation would in fact give us $f(k+1) \leq (2+o(1))k\log_e(k)$.

The following proposition is slightly technical as we need to be very close to equality in various inequalities we use, which makes the necessary calculations slightly awkward.

Proposition 3.5. For $k < 2^{13}$ we have $f(k) \leq 20k$.

Proof. Let $k+1$ be the smallest integer for which the proposition fails, let $r = f(k+1)-1 \geq f(k)+20$ so there exists a (k,r) critical graph and the Proposition 3.3 applies, if we let $x = r/l$ we get $l^3 e^{\frac{2}{l}} \geq \frac{e^x}{x^4+2.5x^3}$. The right hand side is an increasing function on $x \geq 4$ and the left hand side is increasing in l. If $x \geq 39.9$ by using $l \leq 2^{12}$ we get $7\cdot 10^{10} > 2^{36}e^{2^{-11}} \geq \frac{e^{39.9}}{39.9^4+2.5\cdot 39.9^3} > 7\cdot 10^{10}$ so a contradiction.

Hence $f(k+1)-1 < 39.9\left\lceil\frac{k+1}{2}\right\rceil \leq 19.95k+39.9 \leq 20k$ for $800 \leq k$. Repeating the argument with $x=32$ and $k<800$ we deduce that for $k<800$ we have $x<32$ so $f(k+1)-1 < 32\left\lceil\frac{k+1}{2}\right\rceil \leq 16k+32 \leq 20k$ given $k \geq 8$. We can solve the remaining cases using Proposition 3.3 directly. □

The main idea enabling us to find a linear bound is based on an extension of the probabilistic ideas introduced in proof of Propositions 3.3 and it relies on the following bound.

Proposition 3.6. Assuming $r \geq 2^{15}$ one can split G into 2 disjoint $\frac{r}{2}-\frac{r^{2/3}}{\sqrt{2}}$-out graphs.

Proof. We colour the vertices of G into 2 colours uniformly at random. Let A_v be the event that v has less than $t=\frac{r}{2}-\frac{r^{2/3}}{\sqrt{2}}$ children of the same colour. Let X_v be a random variable counting the number of children of v having the same colour as v. We have $X_v \sim \mathrm{Bin}(r,1/2)$ and A_v is equivalent to $X<t$. Now using the bound of Chernoff for the tail of the binomial random variable, given in [4] Appendix A, we have $\mathbb{P}(A_v) \leq e^{-r^{1/3}}$.

Now using $|V| > r$ and Proposition 3.5 gives us $|V| < \frac{r^3}{2}$, this implies $2 \cdot 2^{-|V|} + \frac{r^3}{2} e^{-r^{1/3}} < 1$ for $r \geq 2^{15}$ so there is a colouring of the vertices such that each colour occurs and represents a t-out subgraph. □

Corollary 3.7. If h is even and $f(h) > 2^{15}$ then

$$f(h) - \sqrt{2}(f(h))^{2/3} \leq 2f(h/2).$$

Proof. Let $h = k + 1$, $r = f(k + 1) - 1$ and let G be as before. By the previous proposition G contains 2 disjoint $t = \lceil r/2 - r^{2/3}/\sqrt{2} \rceil$-out subgraphs. We must have $t < f\left(\frac{k+1}{2}\right)$ as else we can find $k + 1$ disjoint cycles. Hence

$$\frac{f(h) - 1}{2} - \frac{(f(h))^{2/3}}{\sqrt{2}} \leq \frac{f(h) - 1}{2} - \frac{(f(h) - 1)^{2/3}}{\sqrt{2}} = \frac{r}{2} - \frac{r^{2/3}}{\sqrt{2}} \leq f(h/2) - 1$$

Which implies the desired result. □

Lemma 3.8. For $h \geq 2^{12}$ we have $f(h) \leq 24h - 64h^{2/3}$.

Proof. We apply induction on h. As a basis we notice that for $2^{12} \leq h \leq 2^{13}$ the result holds as a consequence of Proposition 3.5 as:

$$f(h) \leq 20h \leq 24h - 64h^{2/3}.$$

If $f(h) \leq 2^{15}$ then $f(h) \leq 8h \leq 24h - 64h^{2/3}$ hence we may and will assume that $f(h) \geq 2^{15}$.

For even h we have by the induction hypothesis applied to $h/2$.

$$f(h) - \sqrt{2}f(h)^{2/3} \leq 2f(h/2) \leq 2\left(24h/2 - 64(h/2)^{2/3}\right) = 24h - 2^{1/3}64h^{2/3}$$

If the result fails for h so $f(h) > 24h - 64h^{2/3}$ then as $x - \sqrt{2}x^{2/3}$ is increasing in x for $x \geq 2^{3/2}$ we deduce

$$f(h) - \sqrt{2}f(h)^{2/3} \geq 24h - 64h^{2/3} - \sqrt{2}\left(24h - 64h^{2/3}\right)^{2/3} \geq 24h - 64h^{2/3} - \sqrt{2}(24h)^{2/3}$$

implying $\sqrt{2}(24)^{2/3} \geq (2^{1/3} - 1)64 > 16$, we also have $\sqrt{2}(24)^{2/3} < 12$ as after some rearranging this is equivalent to $\sqrt{2} < 3^{1/3}$ so $12 > 16$ gives us a contradiction. (We used $2^{1/3} > 5/4$ which is true as $2^7 = 128 > 125 = 5^3$.)

If h is odd we use the induction hypothesis applied to $\frac{h+1}{2}$ we get:

$$f(h) - \sqrt{2}f(h)^{2/3} \leq f(h + 1) - \sqrt{2}f(h + 1)^{2/3} \leq 2f\left(\frac{h + 1}{2}\right) \leq$$

$$2\left(24(h + 1)/2 - 64\left(\frac{h + 1}{2}\right)^{2/3}\right) = 24(h + 1) - 2^{1/3}64(h + 1)^{2/3} < 24h + 24 - 2^{1/3}64h^{2/3}$$

If the result fails for h we have $f(h) > 24h - 64h^{2/3}$ so as before

$$f(h) - \sqrt{2}f(h)^{2/3} \geq 24h - 64h^{2/3} - \sqrt{2}(24h - 64h^{2/3})^{2/3} \geq 24h - 64h^{2/3} - \sqrt{2}(24h)^{2/3}$$

implying in turn $24 + \sqrt{2} \cdot (24h)^{2/3} > (2^{1/3} - 1)64h^{2/3}$ and using $h \geq 2^{12}$ we get $\frac{3}{32} + 12 > \frac{3}{32} + \sqrt{2} \cdot 24^{2/3} > (2^{1/3} - 1)64 > 16$ giving us the contradiction once again and completing the proof. □

To summarise we have proven the following theorem.

Theorem 3.9.

$$2k - 1 \leq f(k) \leq 24k$$

With a lot more care and balancing the various inequalities appearing above, using a computer, we have managed to improve the constant to very close to 20 but we believe that without a significant change in the ideas of the method given above it is unlikely that we can bring the constant much lower than 20.

Provided we could prove $f(k) = 2k - 1$ for $k \leq 10$ our idea can be further exploited to prove $f(k) \leq 6k$ for all k. Assuming only $f(3) = 5$ we could prove $f(k) \leq 16k$ for all k. We omit these proofs as they are essentially the same as the proof given above except for a suitable change in the definition of l in Proposition 3.3. Unfortunately the conjecture $f(k) = 2k - 1$ is still an open problem for all $k \geq 3$. We do however note that Proposition 3.2 shows that if for a fixed k the conjecture $f(k) = 2k - 1$ is false there needs to be a counterexample having at most $4k^3$ vertices, in particular testing the conjecture for small values of k can be done in a finite time.

Acknowledgments

I am very grateful to Prof. Imre Leader for his support and useful discussions.

I was provided financial support by Trinity College, Cambridge for which I am also grateful.

References

[1] N. C. Bermond and C. Thomassen, *Cycles in digraphs - a survey*, Journal of Graph Theory 5, (1981), 1-43.

[2] C. Thomassen, *Disjoint cycles in digraphs*, Combinatorica 3, (1983), 393-396.

[3] N. Alon, *Disjoint directed cycles*, J. of Combinatorial Theory, Ser. B 68 (1996), 167-178.

[4] N. Alon, J. H. Spencer *The Probabilistic Method*, John Wiley and Sons Inc., New York, (1992).